



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/972,386	10/05/2001	Michael Loren Lamb	SJ09-2001-0037	5127

33224 7590 10/31/2005

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION  
5600 COTTLE ROAD, DEPT. L2PA/010  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
SAN JOSE, CA 95193-0001

EXAMINER
----------

WU, QING YUAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2194

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/972,386	Applicant(s) LAMB ET AL.	
	Examiner Qing-Yuan Wu	Art Unit 2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/16/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

#### *Claim Objections*

2. Claims 1, 10, 23 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities:  
“possessor” in claim 1 line 16, claim 10 line 22, claims 23 and 25 line 12 should read - -  
processor- -. Appropriate correction is required.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

5. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter because they are lacking utilities. (i.e. the computer program must be stored in a computer readable medium, and executed by a computer element to perform control of a technical procedure).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. PG Pub 20020069245), in view of Blumenau et al (hereafter Blumenau) (U.S. Patent 6,810,396).

8. Kim and Blumenau were cited in the last office action.

9. As to claim 1, Kim teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a storage area network (SAN) comprising one or more digital data processors in communication with one or more storage devices, wherein at least a selected one of the digital data processors operates under an operating system having

a port driver defining a software interface between a class driver and an adapter to which one or more of the storage devices are coupled [pg. 7, paragraphs 107-108, and paragraph 110, lines 7-10; Pg. 10-11, paragraphs 135-143],

the class driver for claiming one or more of the storage devices for access by the operating system and any applications programs executing therein by invoking the port driver to which the selected digital data processor is coupled [pg. 4, paragraph 76; pg. 8, paragraphs 119-

120; pg. 10, paragraph 134; Fig. 23], the class driver issuing a claim request to the port driver for a selected one of the storage devices [pg. 2, paragraph 45; pg. 11, paragraph 143], the port driver issuing a response to the class driver [pg. 7, paragraph 116, lines 7-12].

10. Kim does not specifically teach a filter in communication with the port driver and the class driver, the filter intervening to block claiming of one or more of the storage devices by the class driver, and determining whether the selected storage device has been assigned to the selected digital data processor. However, Kim disclosed a filter program for access control, access share, and access right transfer, etc. [pg. 6, paragraph 94] and a class driver in communication with a port driver for passing requests from host to storage device [pg. 11, paragraph 143]. In addition, Blumenau teaches a filter/adaptor unit that performs filtering function to ensure that only hosts with privileges are able to access the volume and filtering out non-privileged requests [Blumenau, col. 4, line 58-col. 5, line 16].

11. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have combined the teaching Kim with the teaching of Blumenau because both Kim and Blumenau teaches network storage access [pg. 1, paragraph 7; Blumenau, col. 1, lines 25-45] and because the teaching of Blumenau can further enhanced the teaching of Kim by providing addition functionalities to Kim's filter program [Blumenau, col. 4, line 58-col. 5, line 16].

12. Furthermore, Kim and Blumenau does not specifically teach the filter intercepting the response from the port driver, and, based on the determination, determining whether to allow the

Art Unit: 2194

response from the port driver to pass to the class driver. However, Kim disclosed the port driver issuing a response to the class driver [pg. 7, paragraph 116, lines 7-12], and Blumenau disclosed allowing only requests from HBAs that are assigned to selected volumes to have access to those volumes of the storage devices [Blumenau, col. 4, line 58-col. 5, line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have prohibit communication between the port driver and class driver which implicitly prohibits (i.e. storage device not assigned to the selected digital data processor) the access to the storage device as being considered by Kim and Blumenau (i.e. given the scenario in which conventional storage system grant all request accesses [Blumenau, col. 1, lines 26-45; col. 5, lines 13-14]).

13. As to claim 2, Kim as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the filter blocks claiming of a selected storage device by returning a failure code to the class driver in response to its invocation of the port driver for purposes of claiming that storage device [Blumenau, col. 16, lines 41-44]. Kim as modified does not specifically teach wherein the operating system is a Windows NT operating system, however Kim as modified disclosed that a host may run in UNIX or Windows family of operating systems [pg. 1, paragraph 16, lines 7-8]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that Windows family of operating systems would have include Windows NT.

14. As to claim 4, Kim as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including comprising an element in communication with the filter and transmitting thereto identifiers of

one or more storage devices for which claiming is to be any of blocked and not blocked [Blumenau, col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, lines 34-38].

15. As to claim 5, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 4 above.

16. As to claim 6, Kim as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the element transmits to the filter identifiers of one or more storage devices for which claiming is not to be blocked, the filter intervening to block claiming of fiber channel storage devices other than those identified for which claiming is not to be blocked [Blumenau col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, line 34-col. 5, line 16].

17. As to claims 7-8, Kim as modified does not specifically teach wherein the class driver creates a disk object upon successfully claiming a storage device. However, Kim as modified disclosed a bus driver and port driver creating device objects in which the device objects help software manage hardware [pg. 7, paragraph 108, lines 6-9 and paragraph 112, lines 1-9; pg. 10, paragraph 135; Fig. 22]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized the advantage of creating software objects and to better manage the storage devices using these objects by a software as been considered by Kim as modified.

18. As to claim 9, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 6. In addition,

Art Unit: 2194

Kim as modified does not specifically teach the filter responds to identification of a storage device for which storage device claiming is not to be blocked and for which storage device claiming had previously been blocked by invoking the port driver for purposes of claiming the one or more storage devices identified by the port driver as being coupled to the selected digital data processor. However, Kim as modified disclosed providing access to privileged requests and blocking out non-privileged request as indicated by information in a volume configuration management database, and a management console for updating the information [Blumenau col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, line 34-col. 5, line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that the status of the storage devices could be updated as been considered by Kim as modified.

19. As to claim 10, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 2 and 4 above.

20. As to claim 11, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 10 above.

21. As to claim 12, Kim as modified does not specifically teach wherein the manager digital data processor is coupled to the selected digital data processors by a second network. However, Kim as modified disclosed a management console having access to update information of the volume configuration management database [Blumenau col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, line 34-col. 5, line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that the manager digital processor could communicate and update information/criteria for filtering regardless of its location.



22. As to claim 13, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 12 above. In addition, Kim as modified teaches wherein the first network comprises fiber channel [Blumenau, 14, Fig. 1].

23. As to claim 14, Kim as modified does not specifically teach a graphical user interface. However, Kim as modified disclosed system administrator/a management console having access to update information of the volume configuration management database [Blumenau col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, line 34-col. 5, line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that an interface has to be present in order for the information to be enter by the system administrator or by the system administrator through the use of the management console.

24. As to claim 15, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 2, 6 and 10 above. In addition, Kim as modified does not specifically teach wherein the filter blocks the claim request to prevent the class driver from creating a device object for the selected storage device. However, Kim disclosed the port driver issuing a response to the class driver [pg. 7, paragraph 116, lines 7-12], and Blumenau disclosed allowing only requests from HBAs that are assigned to selected volumes to have access to those volumes of the storage devices [Blumenau, col. 4, line 58-col. 5, line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have prohibit communication between the port driver and class driver which implicitly prohibits the access (i.e. when the storage device is not assigned to the selected

digital data processor) to the storage device as being considered by Kim and Blumenau (i.e. given the scenario in which conventional storage system grant all request accesses [Blumenau, col. 1, lines 26-45; col. 5, lines 13-14]).

25. As to claims 16-19, these claims are rejected for the same reason as claims 11-14 above.

26. As to claim 20, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 2, 4, and 15 above.

Kim as modified does not specifically teach a plug-n-play manager that invokes the port driver to populate a data structure with data pertaining to one or more storage devices that are coupled to the adapter by issuing a request packet, and the filter blocking access to selected ones of the storage devices by determining which ones of the storage devices are to be masked and removing from the data structure at least selected data pertaining those determined storage devices. However, Kim as modified disclosed generating a filter table with data pertaining to one or more storage devices that are coupled the adapter [Blumenau, col. 4, lines 60-62], and providing access to privileged requests and blocking out non-privileged request as indicated by information in a volume configuration management database, setting and unsetting a bit mask to indicate accessibility of a storage devices [Blumenau col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 4, line 34-col. 5, line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have include the invoking of the port driver because the port driver is bridge between the class driver and storage devices and responsible for adding and removing the storage devices (i.e. create/remove device object) [pgs. 10-11, paragraphs 134-141], and controlling the access of the storage devices by indicating the availability/accessibility of the storage devices.

27. As to claim 21, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 9 and 20 above.
28. As to claim 22, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 15 and 20 above.
29. As to claim 3, Kim as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the operating system is a Windows 2000 [pg. 6, paragraph 104], and the filter blocks claiming of a selected storage device by returning a failure code in response to such request [Blumenau, col. 6, lines 41-44].
30. As to claim 23, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.
31. As to claim 24, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 15 and 20 above.
32. As to claim 25, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.
33. As to claim 26, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 15 and 20 above.
34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,671,820 to Kelman teaches logical unit number in a storage area network environment.

*Response to Arguments*

35. Applicant's arguments filed 8/16/05 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

36. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

37. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qing-Yuan Wu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3776. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2194


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Qing-Yuan Wu

Examiner

Art Unit 2194

  
W. Thomson  
TC 2100  
SPE AU 2194